Chapter

GOING ALONG TO GET ALONG: VICTIMIZATION INC.

John Solas, PhD [*]
University of Southern Queensland

ABSTRACT

It has long been recognized that "when bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle" (Burke 1770, p. 146). In order words, all that is needed for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing. Edmond Burke made the peril of inaction and dissociation in the midst of wrongdoing clear. When the need to act against victimisation arises, resistance is essential, and should not befall a brave few, for as Burke contended, there is safety in numbers. Despite Burke's advice, social psychological research (most notably by Latané and Darley 1970; Milgam 1974; Zimbardo, Banks and Jaffe 1973) has demonstrated the unreliability of unsolicited prosocial intervention into even the most glaring atrocities. Simply put, the numbers needed to ensure safety may not be there. While the reasons for inaction are both complex and manifold, they invariably point to a lack of supererogation and fiduciary responsibility. People look on rather than intervene either because they do not consider the fate of others their responsibility or business (Zimbardo 2007). Hence, are those who witness rather than contest victimisation

[*] Corresponding Author address: Email: john.solas@usq.edu.au

innocent bystanders or accomplices? The answer has particular consequences for employees made victims of unscrupulous corporate supervisors, leaders, managers, and, most notably, their followers. This paper examines the moral question that inaction against victimisation in the corporate realm raises.

Keywords: bystanders, followership, leadership, management, machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy, work victimisation

WORK VICTIMIZATION

Victimisation in the workplace is neither novel nor insignificant (Tepper, 2007). In spite of the perpetual search for excellence urged some time ago (Peters and Watermen 1982), and evolution of a panoply of anti-bureaucratic or corporate structures and modes of governance (Laloux 2014), exposure to "toxic" (Frost 2003) behaviours and emotions and the so called "dark side" (Furnham and Taylor 2004) of organisational life remains commonplace. In fact, some level of misbehaviour is not only expected, but also considered normal, in organisations (Schein 2000).

Victimization continues to be a virulent, and increasingly prevalent, strain of abuse within the workplace. It can be overt or covert, and range from physical through emotional to psychological abuse (Keashley and Neuman 2010). The perpetrators may by employees or third parties such as patrons. Above all, it is most assuredly intentional and intensely personal. The most common form of victimization at work is nonphysical, most notably bullying and harassment (Tepper 2007). The latest European Survey on Working Conditions across the 28 members of the European Union, revealed of the 217.8 million workers:

- 4.2 million were subjected to physical violence from people belonging to or associated with their workplace
- 4.4 million were subjected to sexual harassment
- 41.4 million were subjected to adverse social behaviour, intimidation (11 million)) and bullying (9 million) in particular (Giaccone, and Di Nunzio, 2015).

Unlike physical aggression, psychological violence can be waged without abusers having to leave their desk or lounge room. Standard electronic and

digital technologies such as email and social network media from Facebook to Twitter have made it quicker and easier for bullies and harassers to embark on brutal cyberbullying campaigns anonymously and at a safe distance from their unwitting victims.

Survey research has found that the majority of online social network (OSN) users are in the working population (rather than students or retirees) and that half of them access their OSN accounts on a daily basis (Foster and Greene 2012).

It is also evident that a good deal of social networking activity is conducted by employees in the workplace, during working hours, using equipment and networks provided by employers (Foster and Greene 2012). The virtual disembodiment of victims makes them appear even less human than they already are to victimizers.

Whatever form it takes, psychological violence undoubtedly exacts a heavy and often lasting toll upon victims (Bond, Tuckey and Dollard 2010). Bond, Tuckey and Dollard (2010) have cited a number of studies demonstrating that prolonged exposure to negative workplace interactions has a profoundly traumatic effect. Moreover, organisations in which victimization is accepted as an inevitable, albeit unsolicited, aspect of organisational life are liable to notable losses in performance and productivity, which accompany the high levels of disengagement, absenteeism, and turnover it generates and conflict it reproduces.

Although the absence of regular, comparative accounting and under-reporting make it difficult to calculate the exact direct and associated costs of victimization, a comprehensive report commissioned by the International Labour Organization (ILO) (conservatively) estimated that workplace violence accounts for between 1 and 3.5 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product of developed nations annually (Hoel, Sparks and Cooper 2001).

In the United States alone, the total annual cost to American taxpayers for workplace violence is estimated to be US$4.2 billion (ILO, 2006). These costs are thought to be significantly higher in developing countries, and those where a culture of violence pervades everyday life and is used to regulate family, social, and interpersonal, as well as institutional relations (Chappell and Di Martino 2006).

An additional liability that is more inestimable than any other, but no less significant, is moral impoverishment. Each and every act of victimization causes a further decline in moral capital, and consequent rise in moral bankruptcy.

BAD SUPERVISORS, MANAGERS AND LEADERS

Victimizers within organizations may either be coworkers or superiors. Nevertheless, attention has tended to focus on the latter because of their greater potential to inflict or constrain abuse (Kellerman 2004). The primacy of high office makes senior staff hard to reach, and hence, more likely to be perpetrators of, rather than candidates for, abuse. Not only does their position reduce the risk of being targeted, but it also insulates them against conventional methods of redress, whether purely disciplinary or more serious, such as dismissal and prosecution. Moreover, supervisors, managers, and leaders are able to justify their behaviour by virtue of their allegiance to the organization. They are simply doing whatever is necessary to ensure the firm's success in today's competitive and ruthless business environment, where creating the capacity to "wow" (Peter 1994) has surpassed the quest to excel (Peters and Waterman 1982), as a key performance indicator. Indeed, Drucker's (2008) advice to management was that:

> An organization in which *people are constantly concerned about feelings and about what other people will or will not like* is not an organization that has good human relations. On the contrary, it is an organization that has very poor human relations. Good human relations, like good manners, are taken for granted. Constant anxiety over other people's feelings is the worst kind of human relations (424).

The notion that victimization at work is typically the result of rogue managers and leaders has been heightened by the growing prevalence of high-profile cases of corporate corruption and collapse (Garrett 2014; McLean and Elkind 2013; Sorkin 2010). One reaction to these scandals has been the notion that this may be the work of narcissistic (Maccoby 2007), Machiavellian (McHoskey, Worzel and Szyarto 1998) and psychopathic (Boddy 2010) leaders. Studies of this triad of 'dark,' misanthropic personalities have proliferated (Dutton 2013), and their occurrence among corporate managers and entrepreneurs has been demonstrated (Mathieu and Babiak 2015).

Clinicians and scholars describe these 'snakes in suits' as not only wrongdoers, but more ominously, as evildoers (Babiak and Hare, 2007). Indeed, victims, too, have characterized them as "evil spirits and cunning actors who feel superior to others, possess dark powers," and are able to "shape-shift into whatever façade is necessary given the audience," rendering

them "impossible for mere mortals to engage with and emerge triumphant" (Tracey, Lutgen-Sandvik, and Alberts 2006, p. 167).

Regrettably, even when detected, resistance to, let alone removal of, bad supervisors, managers, and leaders is rarely quick (Babiak, Neumann, and Hare 2010). The average tenure of Chief Executive Officers (CEO) who vacated their position in the world's 2 500 largest companies in 2003 was 7.6 years. The average among American companies was 8.4 years (McGeehan, 2004). Fewer than 10 per cent of top global enterprises replaced their CEOs in 2003, and only 3 per cent of them did so for performance reasons, which was down from a high of 4.2 per cent the previous year (McGeehan 2004). Some CEOs were forced out as a result of scandals. They included Bernard J. Ebbers of WorldCom; L. Dennis Kozlowski of Tyco International; and Joseph P. Nacchio of Qwest Communications International (McGeehan 2003).

As ironic as it seems, even those who were dismissed had initially been promoted on the basis of their (mis)behaviour (Pech and Slade 2007). There are at least two notable reasons for this apparent oddity. One reason is that Machiavellian, psychopathic, and most notably narcissistic, traits and behaviours may well be (mis)taken for exceptional supervision, management and leadership behaviour by Boards and colleagues (Akhtar, Ahmetoglu and Chamorro-Premuzic 2013). The second reason, a corollary of the first, is that these tendencies may pervade the organization itself (Levenson 1992). In organisations where the Dark Triad (DT) (Paulhaus and Williams, 2002) has become *institutionalised*, the supervisory, management and leadership (mis)behaviours of Machiavellians, narcissists and psychopaths are held in high regard and amply rewarded (Levenson, 1992). In a perverse sense, those with the largest measure of DT traits are the best (of the worst) that the organization has to offer.

Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy are imbricated. Rather than being discrete personalities, the so-called Dark Triad reflects only nuances of a more global personality trait (Rauthmann and Kolar 2012). Moreover, those well endowed with this general attribute are thought to be far fewer in number than has been claimed (Hare 1989), particularly in the workplace (Caponecchia, Sun and Wyatt 2012), with the worst of them either known to be in, or thought highly likely to return to, prison (Harris, Skilling and Rice 2001). Emerging research also suggests that vindictive behaviour is more an effect of bad supervision, management, and leadership (Westerlaken and Woods 2013). A recent study by Westerlaken and Woods, (2013) revealed a correlation between a laissez faire, i.e., an avoidant and a passive, style of leadership and psychopathy. The findings indicate that leaders who possess

both are not particularly prone to take much of a close personal interest in the affairs of others, let alone make an exception of them. The absence of effective leadership does, however, serve to leave employees to their own devices.

BAD FOLLOWERSHIP?

Targets, it seems, ought to be just as, and perhaps more, vigilant about coworkers as they are superiors. A potent form of workplace abuse to emerge in recent years, is "mobbing," the collective harassment of a worker by coworkers (Wornham 2003, p. 29). As Chappell and Di Martino (2006) point out,

> Mobbing typically involves a group of workers ganging up on a target employee and subjecting that person to psychological harassment. Mobbing includes behaviours such as making continuous negative remarks about a person or criticizing them constantly; isolating a person by leaving them without social contacts; gossiping or spreading false information about a person; or ridiculing a person constantly. The impact upon a person of what might appear on the surface to be minor single actions of this type can be devastating (p. 22).

Although little distinction is made between mobbing and bullying (Chappell and Di Martino 2006), mobbing is arguably more destructive since it can be more insidious, conspiratorial and elusive, and can be made worse still if it is led or ignored by senior staff.

Despite variations between individual studies and between different types of violent behaviour, the following groups, appear to be most at risk:

- Female workers
- Workers in the youngest age groups
- Inexperienced employees
- Employees in precarious work
- Employees from ethnic minorities (Hoel, Sparks and Cooper 2001, p. 25)

It is no surprise that the members of these particular groups are imperilled since they constitute the most vulnerable workers in deregulated labour markets. Their vulnerability leaves them open to exploitation and attack and

on the defensive. Indeed, a paralysing sense of powerlessness is commonly experience by victims of abuse (ILO 2006, p. 24). Not only is powerlessness a consequence of, but it also appears be the basis upon which staff are singled for, victimization. For some time now, victims have been thought to invite abuse and share a certain affinity with their victimizers (Fattah 1989). Studies have indicated that the less distant (Mathiesen and Einarsen 2001) and more agreeable (Milam, Spitzmueller and Penny 2009) individuals are within the work environment, the more and less likely they are to be victimized.

According to Fattah (1989), research has also revealed striking similarities between victim and offender populations. This is not to say, of course, that all victims share the same attributes as their assailants. However, it does suggest that the two populations are not as heterogeneous as might be expected. It also shows how erroneous it is to think that offenders simply select their victims at random. Although this research has focussed on victims of crime, it has implications for workplace victimization, particularly in terms of the influence of demographic factors in victim selection, most notably, proximity, income, age, ethnicity, gender, and interpersonal relationships. The research suggests that victim and offender roles may be complementary rather than necessarily antagonistic.

ORGANIZED VICTIMISATION

There are, undoubtedly, bad supervisors, managers, and leaders who, by dint of nature or nurture, or more likely both, are predominantly Machiavellian, narcissistic, or psychopathic. Their ignominious reign in the corporate world tends to be unmercifully long before news of declining profits finally surface (Kellerman 2004). There is no doubt that the buck stops with those at the top. However, victimization is not the sole preserve of bad bosses. Those who follow them cannot evade their share of responsibility. Some, as Milgram (1974) demonstrated, simply follow orders to appease, profit from, or defer to, authority. Other followers take unimpeded opportunities to engage in the victimization of coworkers as much for their own as debased reasons as those of their superiors (Latif, Abideen and Nazar 2011). Others still, elect to remain silent spectators (Zimbardo 2007). Whether directly involved in victimization or not, all are denied the moral high ground. Although abstention from direct participation may appear to offer a defence against culpability, the weight of historical evidence from an ever-expanding catalogue of ‘crimes of obedience’ (Kelman and Hamilton 1989; O’Grady 2013), clearly demonstrates

that there is neither virtue nor vindication in selective mutism when speaking up and out could curtail or prevent harm. Nothing short of active resistance is cause for mitigation or righteousness. An interesting finding in the Milgram (1974) experiments was that not only did compliant and defiant subjects take only partial responsibility for administering (fictional) electric shocks to victims, but they also blamed the victim.

While recipients may be shocked to find themselves subjected to abuse, they might be even more distressed to discover that they were not hapless victims. There was most likely an ulterior motive involved, making the violation premeditated. They were harassed and or bullied because of their sex, creed, colour, or *other* point(s) of discrimination associated with their identity or affiliation. Moreover, as the experiments conducted by Milgram (1974), and others (Lerner and Simmons, 1966), showed, victims are thought to receive the treatment they asked for or otherwise deserved. Such rationalizations enable victimizers to justify their retributive or restorative behaviour and retain a sense of justice (Lerner 2003; Harvey, Callan and Matthews 2014).

Worse still, victimization may well be calculated, but not without at least tacit institutional warrant. Milgram (1974) theorized that individuals' inhibition against harming helpless others could be overcome when they joined an organization to which they could attribute responsibility for individual acts.

While victimizers are the instruments of abuse, they would not be instrumental without the right environment. The success of victimizers not only relies on deliberation, planning and collaborative effort, but also general indifference. Little wonder that "toxicity and emotional pain is (sic) a *normal by-product* of organizational life" (Frost 2003, p. 8).

The question is, at what point do toxicity and pain within an organization become *abnormal*? After all, the systematic extermination of millions of people was generally accepted as *normal*, until it was eventually deemed a holocaust, and its perpetrators were found guilty of crimes against humanity. How many times since the Shoah have attempts been made to defend the legitimacy of genocide on normative grounds, and how many more before the attempt to justify them ceases?

Codes of conduct and ethics and corporate values now permeate the business community (Preuss 2010). While codes and values seek to avoid the tragedies that arise from a warped, or at least misguided, sense of common decency, instituting these has not deterred, let alone eliminated, misbehaviour. This is perhaps not surprising since organizations are left to police internal

misconduct. If codes and values are to have any chance of successfully regulating unruly behaviour employees at every level must be willing to adhere to them, and trust that these will be applied, without fear or favour. Staff will not actively resist their own wrongful obedience, and indeed may not even recognize it as such, unless the culture of their immediate work environment instills an abiding sense of justice in, and encourages, them to exercise autonomous independent judgment, particularly in the face of both subtle and extreme pressures placed upon them to obey those in authority. Codes of conduct and ethics and corporate values will not suffice until the majority of workers, i.e., people, cease to be bystanders and, hence, followers.

CONCLUSION

Workplace violence is indeed a fact of organizational life. While much intraorganizarional deviance is attributed to the occurrence of Machiavellian, narcissistic, and, most notoriously, psychopathic tendencies, particularly among those at the top, research has shown that DT contributes more to poor job performance than counterproductive work behaviour (O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks and McDaniel 2012).

Evidence suggests that the occurrence of victimization is not so much due the prevalence of dark personality traits, as it is from cultural and structural conditions that are not only ineffectual in driving it out, but actually breed it. The findings of recent studies like that of Westerlaken and Woods, (2013) support the views of an earlier generation of organizational theorists, such Burns (1978), Greenleaf (1997), Maslow (1998), and McGregor (2006), who argued that the more humanistic the approach to supervision, management, leadership and followership is, the more likely the forecast for a temperate cultural and moral climate.

Despite Burke's (1770) dictum about the rationality of self-interest, it has not shown itself to be the most reliable motive for intervention against evildoers. Indeed, some individuals are bound to regard intercession as imprudent, i.e., an unmitigated risk to self interest, while others may share a common interest in determining the fate of particular individuals, from segregation and internment through ostracism and exile to genocide. Ultimately, there may be no greater force for maintaining right conduct than private conscience, though not untutored, but duly tempered by the lived experienced of the victimized.

REFERENCES

Akhtar, R., Ahmetoglu, G., & Chamorro-Premuzi, T. (2013). Greed is good? Assessing the relationship between entrepreneurship and subclinical psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 420-425.

Babiak, P., & Hare, R. (2006). *Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work*. New York: Harper-Collins.

Babiak, P., Neumann, C., & Hare, R. (2010). Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. *Behavioural Sciences and the Law*, 28, 174-193.

Black, P. J., Woodworth, M., & Porter, S. (2014). The big bad wolf? The relation between the Dark Triad and the interpersonal assessment of vulnerability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 52–56.

Boddy, C. (2010). Corporate psychopaths and organizational type. *Journal of public Affairs*, 10, 300-312.

Bond, S., Tuckey, M., & Dollard, M. (2010). Psychosocial safety climate, workplace bullying, and symptoms of posttraumatic stress. *Organisational Development Journal*, 28, 37-56.

Burke, E. (1770). Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents: The two speeches on America. In *Select Works of Edmund Burke* (vol. 1). Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Caponecchia, C., Sun., A., & Wyatt, A. (2012). 'Psychopaths' at work? Implications for lay persons' use of labels and behavioural criteria for psychopathy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 399-408.

Chappell, D., & Di Martino, V. (2006). *Violence at work* (3rd ed.). Geneva: International Labour Office.

Drucker, P. (2008). *Management* (Rev. ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Dutton, K. (2012). *The wisdom of psychopaths: Lessons in life from saints, spies and serial killers*. London: Arrow.

Fattah, E. (1989). Victims and victimology: The facts and the rhetoric. *International Review of Victimology*, 1, 43-66.

Foster, N., & Greene, G. (2012). Legal issues of online social networks and the workplace. *Journal of Law, Business and Ethics*, 18, 131-167.

Frost, P. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Furnham, A., & Taylor, J. (2004). *The dark side of behaviour at work: Understanding and avoiding employees leaving, thieving and deceiving*. New York: Macmillan.

Garrett, B. (2014). *Too big to jail: How prosecutors compromise with corporations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giaccone, M., & Di Nunzio, D. (2015). *Violence and harassment in European workplaces: Causes, impacts and policies*. Dublin: Eurofound.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Harris, G., Skilling, T., & Rice, M. (2001). The Construct of Psychopathy. *Crime and Justice*, 28, 197-264.

Harvey, A., Callan, M., & Matthews, W. (2014). How much does effortful thinking underlie observers' reactions to victimization? *Social Justice Research*, 27, 175–208.

Hoel, H., Sparks, K., & Cooper, C. (2001). *The cost of violence/stress at work and the benefits of a violence/stress-free working environment*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

International Labour Office. (2006, April 5). Taming the beast: A look at the many forms and guises of workplace Violence. *The world of work*, 56, 23-26.

International Labour Office. (2009). *Violence at work in the European Union* [fact sheet]. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Kellerman, B. (2004). Bad leadership: *What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Boston MA: Harvard University Press.

Kelman, H., & Hamilton, L. (1989). *Crimes of obedience*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. (2010). Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 32, 48-70.

Laloux, F. (2014). *Reinventing organizations: A guide to creating organizations inspired by the next stage of human consciousness*. Belgium: Nelson Parker.

Latif, A., Abideen, Z., & Nazar, M. (2011). Individual political behaviour in organizational relationships. *Journal of Politics and Law*, 4, 199-210.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lerner, M. J. (2003). The justice motive: Where social psychologists found it, how they lost it, and why they may not find it again. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 388-399.

Lerner, M. J., & Simmons, C. H. (1966). Observers' reaction to the 'innocent victim': Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 203-210.

Levenson, M. (1992). Rethinking psychopathy. *Theory and Psychology*, 2, 51-71.

Maccoby, M. (2007). *Narcissistic leaders: Who succeeds, who fails*. Boston MA: Harvard University Press.

Maslow, A. (1998). *Maslow on management*. New York: Wiley.

Matthiesen, S., & Einarsen, S. (2001). MMPI-2 configurations among victims of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 467 484.

Mathieu, C., & Babiak, P. (2015). Tell me who you are, I'll tell you how you lead: Beyond the Full-Range Leadership Model, the role of corporate psychopathy on employee attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 87, 8–12.

McGeehan, P. (2003, May 27) *Study finds number of chiefs forced to leave jobs is* up. New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2003/05/12/business/study-finds-number-of-chiefs-forced-to-leave-jobs-is-up.html

McGeehan, P. (2004, May 17) *Corporate turnover at the top slowed in 2003, study finds*. New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/17/business/corporate-turnover-at-the-top-slowed-in-2003-study-finds.html

McGregor, D. (2006). *The humanistic side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McHoskey, J., Worzel, W., & Szyarto, C. (1998). Machiavellianism and Psychopathy, Journal of *Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 192-210.

McLean, B., & Elkind, P. (2013). *The smartest guys in the room: The amazing rise and fall of Enron*. New York: Penguin.

Milam, A., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14, 58-69.

Milgram, S (1974). Obedience to authority. New York: Harper and Row.

O'Boyle, E., Forsyth, D., Banks, G., & McDaniel, M. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work outcomes: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 557–579.

O'Grady, C. (2013). Wrongful obedience and the professional practice of law. *Journal of Law, Business and Ethics*, 19, 9-45.

Peters, T. (1994). *The pursuit of wow: Every person's guide to topsy-turvy times*. New York: Vintage Books.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Warner.

Pech, R., & Slade, B. (2007). Organisational sociopaths: Rarely challenged, often promoted. Why? *Society and Business Review*, 2, 254-269.

Preuss, L. (2009). Codes of conduct in organisational context: From cascade to lattice-work of codes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 471–487.

Rauthmann, J., & Kolar, G., How "dark" are the dark traits? Examining the perceived darkness of narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53, pp. 884-889.

Schein, E. (2000). The next frontier: Edgar Schein on organizational therapy. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 31-48.

Sorkin, A. (2010). *Too big to fail*. New York: Penguin.

Tepper, B. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261-289.

Tracy, S., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Alberts, J. (2006). Nightmares, demons and slaves: Exploring the painful metaphors of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 20, 148-185.

Westerlaken, K., & Woods, P. (2013). The relationship between psychopathy and the Full Range Leadership Model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 41–46.

Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer effect: Understanding how good people turn evil*. New York: Random House.

LCH